

Remarks

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action.

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claim 1 was rejected, claims 2-11 were objected to, and claims 12-20 have been allowed. Because claims 13-15 depend from claim 1, which was rejected, Applicant assumes that claims 13-15 stand objected to rather than allowed.

By this paper, arguments are presented below regarding the patentability of claim 1, and reconsideration of that claim is respectfully requested. Furthermore, new claims 21-24 have been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,844,131 to Gablemann et al. ("Gablemann et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In that regard, claim 1 requires that the tire valve stem be configured "to extend through" the opening in the housing. By contrast, the tire valve 20 of Gablemann et al. extends into, but not through, cavity 56 of housing 44. Thus, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 1 is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

New Claims


New claims 21-24 have been added for consideration by the Examiner.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicant believes that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Uleski

By 
Mark E. Stuenkel
Reg. No. 44,364
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 28, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351